

REMARKS

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-31 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by a new reference, Soltys, U.S. Patent No. 6,460,848. The Examiner's rejection is flawed because Soltys does not teach every element of Appellant's claimed invention.


Soltys does not teach, disclose, or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 24, and 28. Soltys teaches monitoring a game of chance, acquiring repetitive images, comparing each image to the previous one, and detecting changes (col.13, lines 16-32). Even though by performing the steps above changes in cards can be detected and wager values can be stored, Soltys does not anywhere teach or suggest counting repetitive actions. Soltys suggests several monitoring tools, such as a card deck reader that reads a symbol from each card, a chip tray reader that takes images from a chip tray, a table monitor that takes event images from a gaming table, and a drop box that verifies deposit. See, Soltys at col. 2, lines 21-52. But Soltys does not teach or suggest counting repetitive actions. In contrast, Applicant's invention as claimed teaches monitoring repetitive actions through "obtaining a stream of data that includes a plurality of the repetitive actions" and "parsing the stream of digital image data to count the plurality of repetitive actions" (claim 1; claims 24 and 28 contain similar language). Applicant's invention specifically indicates that by merely comparing images taken at different times, the number count of a repetitive action, such as hands played, can be obtained and used to monitor the repetitive action.

The present invention as claimed relates to counting repetitive actions using parsed digital images. Soltys does not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed. Therefore, the claims distinguish over the reference and are believed to be allowable. New claims 32-36 add further limitations to allowable claims, and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

All rejections having been addressed, and in view of the foregoing, the claims are believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Date: June 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP


DAVID H. JAFFER, Reg. No. 32243
For David A. Jakopin, Reg. No. 32995
650-233-4790

Customer No. 27498